

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed August 10, 2007. Claims 1, 2 and 4-36 are pending in the application and were rejected in the Office Action. For at least the reasons discussed below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Section 102 Rejections**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-25, 27-29, and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0026355 issued to Mitsuoka ("*Mitsuoka*").

Although Applicants believe that independent Claims 1, 21, 28 and 32 are allowable for the reasons given in Applicants' previous response, Applicants have amended these independent claims to include the limitations of canceled Claim 7 in order to expedite allowance of this case. Therefore, these claims are addressed below with respect to the Examiner's rejection of Claim 7 under Section 103.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter these amendments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 since Applicants believe that the amendments place all claims in condition for allowance due to the Section 103(c) argument presented below.

**Section 103 Rejections**

The Examiner rejects Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mitsuoka*. In addition, the Examiner rejects Claims 7, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mitsuoka* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0065718 issued to Otani et al. ("*Otani*").

As noted above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 21, 28 and 32 to include the limitations of canceled Claim 7. As noted above, Claim 7 is rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over *Mitsuoka* in view of *Otani*. However, Applicants

respectfully submit that a rejection of Claim 7 (and thus now independent Claims 1, 21, 28 and 32) is not proper pursuant to Section 103(c)(1), which states:

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

35 U.S.C. § 103(c)(1). In this case, *Mitsuoka* has only qualified as prior art under Section 102(e). Furthermore, at the time the claimed invention of the present application was made, both the claimed invention and the subject matter of *Mitsuoka* were owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person – Fujitsu Limited (e.g., see Reel/Frame 020079/0571 and 011504/0773).

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 21, 28 and 32, as well as the remaining claims of the present application, which depend from these independent claims.

**CONCLUSION**


Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Brian W. Oaks, Attorney for Applicant, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6986.

Applicants believe no fee is due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Brian W. Oaks  
Reg. No. 44,981

Date: November 12, 2007

Correspondence Address:

**Customer Number: 05073**